

**REMARKS****I. INTRODUCTION**

In response to the Office Action dated December 23, 2005, claims 18, 19, 38, 40, 43 and 44 have been canceled, and claim 17 has been amended. Claims 17, 20-35, 37, 41 and 42 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

**II. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the detailed information prepared by the Examiner in the Office Action dated December 23, 2005, reviewing the basis for each remaining rejection, and also indicating the allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended the claims to limit them to the subject matter indicated as allowable.

At page 10 of the Office Action, claim 18 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 37 was indicated as allowable.

Applicants have rewritten claim 18 in independent form by incorporating the "*in vitro*" limitation of claim 18 into claim 17, from which claim 18 depended. Accordingly, claims 17 and 37, and any claims that depend from claim 17 or 37, are now allowable.

**III. CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of limiting the claims to the subject matter indicated as allowable and do not introduce new matter or require further search. Claim 17 has been amended to introduce the limitation recited in canceled claim 18, which was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. The only other amendments involve cancellation of rejected claims. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

**IV. ENABLEMENT**

Page 2 of the Office Action indicates that claims 17, 19-35, 38 and 40-44 stand rejected as previously indicated under the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims

19, 38, 40 and 43-44 have all been canceled. Each of claims 20-35 and 41-42 now depend from claim 17, which has been amended to incorporate all limitations of canceled claim 18. Because claim 18 was not subject to the enablement rejection, this rejection is now moot with respect to the currently pending claims.

#### V. OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Page 2 of the Office Action indicates that claims 17, 20-26 and 28-35 stand rejected as previously indicated under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Each of claims 20-26 and 28-35 now depend from claim 17, which has been amended to incorporate all limitations of canceled claim 18. Because claim 18 was not subject to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, this rejection is now moot with respect to the currently pending claims.

#### VI. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

CANADY & LORTZ  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

333 N. Indian Hill Blvd., Ste. 107  
Claremont, CA 91711  
(310) 482-1360

Date: February 21, 2006

By: 

Name: Karen S. Canady  
Reg. No.: 39,927